



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

this great force is a real force, different from and greater than any physical force, political science will do well to take cognizance of it. For if the world is to be made safe for democracies, democracies must be made worth while. And unless men and women can practice the arts of democracy in matters of fuel, street cars, and garbage disposal, what hope is there that these same people can be expected to set up larger democracies, call them States, and expect those States to behave themselves orderly and efficiently.

These matters are not foreign, therefore, to the needs of a governed world. The expression of views by men and women cannot long be safely repressed. This war is in no small sense a result of long years of repression and gag rule in a society made up of group organizations mutually suspicious and antagonistic. The goal of this new attempt to fashion democracy is an association of individuals, not of groups, and the society of nations that shall do away with the necessity for war must be an expression of direct popular control. Mr. Hoover said a few days ago, "Unless a democracy can find in itself some solution of organization that is entirely different from the organization of an autocracy, and yet which is equally effective, it cannot defend itself against autocratic organization, and is, therefore, a faith not worth fighting for and one which cannot long survive." If people can learn to control efficiently their religious, economic, and political relations close at hand there will then be some hope that they will be able to control these same relations farther away in the realm of international behavior. Under the auspices of the Academy of Political Science in the city of New York a national conference on foreign relations of the United States was held at Long Beach, N. Y., during the week of May 28 last. Many of the leading men and women of our country participated in the discussions. A valuable volume of the proceedings of the conference has been issued and distributed. There is soon to be another conference for the purposes of further discussion about the foreign relations of the United States. Surely that is hopeful business. But when forty men and women gather together in an old red school house down the village street and around the corner and there solve the questions of transportation of milk, the delivery of mail, or the salaries of teachers, they are also carrying on the business of democracy, a co-operative human enterprise of great significance not for themselves alone, but for the world. For unless democracy can work in matters of "bread," there is little hope of its success with "kingdoms, stars, and sky that holds them all." And the full significance of this comes home to us when Lloyd George says, "The real battle front is not in Flanders or France. The real battle front is in the soul of our people."

A LITTLE MATTER OF LABEL

THE man who has not forgotten his faith and hope in a governed world is hard put to it these days to find for himself a name that will mean anything and not at the same time get him into jail. We do not refer to the conscientious objector whose name seems to suit him, and who has little concern about jails anyhow. We do not refer to the members of the "People's Council," who are seeking with a rather muricated quixotism to establish "a representative body for the people," zealously overlooking with withers unwrung that not altogether unknown representative organ familiar to us as the United States Government, a bit of machinery upon which the people have been working with no little assiduity for over four generations. We are not thinking of Congressmen who seem to lose track of the ends for which this Government is striving—men, money, and might—as they pile up mountains of words in the interest of what used to be called "freedom of speech" and the "rights of Congress." We are not thinking of the college trustees and their hired men, the professors, who together are musing up our minds just now with discussion about "academic freedom," and that at a time when we are after real game. We are not thinking of any of the other syndicalists aiming at "quick action" in the direction of a reformed world by means of sabotage and other types of destructive propaganda. We refer to none of these, with their disregard for reflection, their pragmatic faith in pure intuition, their *élan vital*. They may get as excited as they wish over matters of constitutional import, and play joyfully that between friends the Constitution means something in time of war.

But the people to whom we refer are the sane among those who formerly were proud to be called "pacifists," the people who have taken and are taking their Government seriously in its avowed program that we are in this war to down militarism, to establish the modes of justice among the nations, and to end war. While they do not change their views, it is manifest that they must change their name, for in the *New York Times* of October 10 there is an editorial entitled "*They Never Make a Distinction*," which contains these words:

"No pacifist of any kind can ever talk or write about the war much more than a single sentence without revealing that he or she is possessed and obsessed by the strange belief that because war is a bad thing, all who take part in it are on the same moral level and open to the same condemnation. This is the absurd fallacy which underlies all pacifism and vitiates every argument offered by the followers of that miserable cult. As logic, the leap thus made from premise to conclusion is without the slightest warrant in either experience or fact, yet every pacifist is under some mysterious and inexorable compulsion to make it every time he discusses either war in general or this war in particular, and always the result is that sane critics are either angered or disgusted—or both."

Whether this be an accurate description of a "pacifist" or no, the honest supporters of our Government in its tremendous enterprise of establishing democracy supreme over autocracy must find a new name, for to be ill-named is to be half-hung.

And there ought to be a decent name for the man who insists that the few should cease to have the power to involve the world in war for the sake of their private interests or ambitions. Somehow the men and women who are opposed to the malevolent influences of secret diplomacy, who are first, last, and always opposed to those methods which foment suspicions, envies, hatreds, fears, and conquests, who are willing to sacrifice themselves to the last full measure that institutions of justice may close forever the temples of Janus, who are going forth to give their all in behalf of a more rational world,—such men should have a name which carries in it no implications of cowardice, treason, or unreason.

A good name is rather to be chosen than great riches. We have no right to call these people knaves, for the things they pursue are the things pursued by Lloyd George, Mr. Asquith, Sir Edward Grey, M. Briand, Woodrow Wilson, Kerensky, and all other democrats. They are not selfish. Many of them are sacrificing to the limit. They are not unpatriotic, because they are unstintingly supporting their governments. They are not fools, unless the best writers and thinkers of all times have been fools. They deserve a fair name, for a good name is better than precious ointment. What shall it be?

CHARACTER EDUCATION IN OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS

WAR accomplishes one desirable thing: it arouses men to think. Where men think, undesirable conditions are discovered and remedies sought. Where great reforms are wished for, thinking men turn instinctively toward the church or toward the school—in largest numbers toward the school. As the twig is bent, the tree's inclined, to change social ills of wide extent we must begin with the child, say the men of vision. So, naturally, we find the educators turning again in these latter days to character education of boys and girls as the necessary first steps toward a more ordered and rational world. The present lamentable situation has inevitably aroused a new interest in the various problems involved in character education. And this is well.

Old and fundamental questions are becoming new again. Any adequate survey of any portion of the field of public education would, it will be agreed, be essentially clear in at least three particulars: It would state and clarify the fundamental purposes back of the enter-

prise; it would plan in the most rational way possible what should be taught in order to bring these purposes to pass; and, finally, it would set forth the right methods to be pursued in teaching such subject-matter. These are, of course, vital phases in any inclusive investigation of any problem of public education. And so men are asking again, Why do advancing nations commit themselves with such increasing faith, often with seeming desperation, to the policy of public education? Why do men and women enter the teacher's field, give their all to the schools, live, survive, and perish in the name of education? Why is so much laborious attention paid to courses of study? And how shall we go about the business of realizing the aims thus understood and pursued? The war has revitalized these questions.

Superficially the answer to these questions seems easy. It is generally agreed that the schools exist to advance personality. Whatever contributes to the enlargement and enrichment of one's personality, we say, is educational. Therefore our questions seem to be answered at the outset, and little more left to be said. But as we examine the word personality, difficulties appear. To say what we mean by personality is not easy. That which we call personality in others we find to be elusive and far from definite. Because of personality we see men with little talent or equipment, as we ordinarily use these words, often distancing men seemingly far better "fitted." We may call it subtle charm, affability, frankness, sincerity, power to get ahead. Whatever it is, we find it often outranking information and technique, and an attribute even of unlettered persons. It seems to thrive in, and, indeed, to irradiate an atmosphere of industry, open-mindedness, self-confidence without conceit, initiative, willingness, imagination, humor, reverence for the unknown. Whatever it is, men often seem to be successful, not so much because of what they know as because of what they possess of these aptitudes which we summarize as personality. Lacking personality of these high qualities, men fight and fail.

Many, if not most, of these qualities which enter into personality are undoubtedly born of the blood. Health, sometimes disease, some subtle factor of variation working out through the law of heredity may be at the heart of it. But we are forced to believe that personality, whatever it may mean, is also acquired. One's personality takes no little bent and color from one's environment and from an acquaintance with principles. An acquaintance with the laws of morality should, and probably does contribute its share to what we call personality. Our own view is that one's personality depends very much upon one's familiarity, implicit or explicit, with the great ethical beliefs and endeavors of men. The content of knowledge is ethical. At least, knowl-